Approved 9-26-2012
Meeting Minutes for Wednesday, September 12, 2012
Press Box 3, 3:00 – 5:00 pm

Members Present: Cindy Bower, Stan Bursten, Angel Cardenas, Gordon Coburn, Steve DaVega, Melanie Eckford-Pros sor, Jack Friedlander, Chris Johnston, Jennifer Maupin, Bronwen Moore, David Morris, Kenley Neufeld, Dean Nevins (President), Kathy O’Connor, Gail Reynolds, Sally Saenger, Jan Schultz, Patricia Stark, Laurie Vasquez, Dan Wrentmore

Members Absent: Debbie Mackie, Joel Negroni (student representative)

Guest(s): Cornelia Alsheimer (IA/Senate Liaison), Liz Auchincloss, Priscilla Butler, Pat English, Lori Gaskin, Paul McGarry, Art Olguin, Erick Pirayesh (Channels)

1.0 Call to Order
1.1 Public comment – no requests received – President Nevins explained the reason for the Senate change in venue was due to the Aspen Institute’s use of BC 214 for their interviews.

1.2 Approval of Agenda
M/S/C To approve the current agenda (Bursten/Schultz)

1.3 Approval of Minutes 7-11-12
M/S/C To approve the meeting Minutes of 7-11-2012 (Schultz/Bursten)

2.0 Reports
2.1 President Report (Dean Nevins)
President Nevins reported CAC has complete Divisional representation and AP is still missing a few Division reps. A spreadsheet, available in Google docs, where Senators can fill in the Division rep information. For any Senate committee vacancies, the Senator from that Division would be contacted by President Nevins. A call went out for someone to chair CTL. Progress is being made on the remaining SLO data and Senators were asked to remind the chairs in their Division to make certain everything pertaining to SLOs has been completed.

2.2 Planning and Resources Liaison Report (Kenley Neufeld)
President-elect Neufeld reported P&R oriented their new members and then they reviewed the adopted budget and other work the Academic Senate did over the summer. The remainder of the time was spent discussing the Continuing Education reorganization with the recommendation that Superintendent/President Gaskin be invited to attend an October meeting with P&R to discuss/review the reorganization details. President-elect Neufeld, liaison to several other committees, added there were no other reports because the committees had not met.

2.3 Academic Policies Liaison Report
President Nevins reported AP also had a member orientation and discussions focused on the upcoming policies that would be forwarded from the Senate and the news about the big push to get all Board policies reviewed and Board approved by the end of the year. Of note: At SBCC there are Board Policies and Administrative Procedures and for this campus the Administrative Procedures are the most important because at many colleges these items would be negotiated, where at SBCC they are found in the Administrative Procedures.

2.4 CPC/Curriculum and Instruction Liaison Report (Kathy O’Connor)
Senator O’Connor reported that CAC’s new technical hearing/review process has been put into place. November 5 would be the deadline to submit modified and new courses that would be effective summer/fall 2013 and entered/launched in curricUNET. The exception to the deadline
would be any new transfer degrees and the latest for those exceptions would be at the start of the 2013 spring semester. Workshop request: Because there will be no fast track option in place to remove repeatability, and all courses that need to have the repeatability removed would also need to go through the CAC hearing/review process a request to have a workshop was made. Note: All Course Outlines of Record should be thoroughly reviewed and updated at least every 5-6 years to meet the current expectations/regulations for articulation purposes.

CPC: Adopted budget – refer to the Joe Sullivan PowerPoint (email). Recap of CPC meeting discussions: a) How hourly positions were filled and the 50%; b) $44,000 of approved Program Review items; c) The 50% reduction in hourly positions to be revisited and okayed by EVP; d) Balanced Budget Workgroup report to be emailed to Senators on topics such as: vacant positions, enrollment strategies, proposed zero based budgeting; e) Discussed Continuing Education recommendations; f) Discussed Accreditation midterm report; g) Reviewed adopted budget; h) Approved two auxiliary funded (not from general fund dollars) classified positions – one a full time office assistant in community service and facility rental, the other an increase in a food services position from 60% to 80%; i) Reviewed ITC’s general rankings from last year’s Program Review (the refresh is on with a backlog). Senator O’Connor, liaison to several other committees, added there were no other reports because the committees had not met.

2.5 IA Liaison Report (Cornelia Alsheimer-Barthel)
IA liaison Cornelia Alsheimer-Barthel reported the new appointee to the Benefits Committee would be Priscilla Butler, along with Ignacio Alarcón and herself, and their task would be to look at health insurance plans/proposals for the new academic year. The ongoing negotiations were discussed. In the current contract (expires December 31, 2012) the IA reopeners are Article XII and Health Insurance benefits and the reopen negotiation team will be: Lynne Stark, Mark Ferrer and Cornelia Alsheimer-Barthel. A Plenary Session has been scheduled at the Forum, Friday, October 5 from 2:30-4:00 p.m., and in addition to talking about the budget, the I.A. would like to hear proposals from faculty for the next contract.

2.6 EVP Report (Jack Friedlander) (Attachments B, C, and D)
EVP reported the interviewers from Aspen Institute have been so impressed with our institution and we have better data for them than we had last year.

The Board of Governors just passed the new registration/enrollment priorities and the start date has been pushed back to 2014. New students would go to the head of the enrollment line only if they have completed the orientation and academic assessment. Students would also need to have an academic or vocational education plan and make progress towards that educational plan, within the first year, with a C average or better and have no excessive withdrawals. Returning students with more than 100 credits would not qualify for priority enrollment. What that means for SBCC: we need to get our systems in place and manage/work out the whole industry of challenges to meet the deadline. We also have a lag because enrollment begins in November for spring (and grades are not in) and then in April for summer/fall (and grades are not in).

Fall 2012 enrollment stats: Headcount the college is down about 1.7% and we are up in our unit count. Over all we have fewer students taking more units. Resident students we are down 3.7%. Over all we will be down approximately 1000 students due to the 117 sections that were cut.

SLOs: Dr. Friedlander explained that we are accountable for each step of the SLO process, and the state expects 100% compliance for accreditation. Dr. Friedlander recommended a proposal:
when faculty, turn in their grades they also turn in their SLO scores, or whatever is required, at that time. That way there would be a due date built into the process. It would become a part of what we need to do. Dr. Friedlander also suggested a larger more robust Educational Programs SLO workgroup assimilate the varied SLO issues and data.

Prop 30: If this passes Dr. Friedlander would also like to have the Block Scheduling template revisited, in anticipation of the sections that would need to be added for fall.

3.0 Unfinished Business - Action
none

4.0 Action
none

5.0 Unfinished Business - Discussion
none

6.0 Discussion
6.1 Accreditation Midterm Report
President Nevins instructed the Senators to review the report attached to the Agenda and forward any comments to him in preparation for the next Senate meeting.

6.2 New and Replacement Positions
President Nevins explained, last year because of budgetary issues, the Senate ranked retirement positions for the first time and agreed the six departments, denied positions due to the ranking results, would be able to bring them forward as replacement positions, to be ranked for this year. Replacement positions have always been filled unless the data has suggested otherwise and the Senate has relied on the deans and the EVP for that data. Presumably everyone who retires will ask for a replacement. The total pool of last year’s replacements plus current year replacements will already be larger than the number of slots available. The question before you: does the Senate want to include new positions?

Superintendent/President Gaskin reported the number of positions that would be available this year, equals the number of retirements or separations from the institution. Note about Prop 30: Dr. Gaskin explained, Prop 30 would bring us more discretionary revenue and we would need to figure out how to deploy that discretionary revenue. We may not have a choice for some of the revenue because if the state unfreezes the FON (Faculty Obligation Number) then at some point, and not next year, but at some point very soon, we would need to fill the delta and that would be 13 new positions.

Result: For this year the memo to department chairs should go out for Replacement positions only. All in one pool for ranking are faculty leaving/retiring this year and the remaining replacement faculty positions from last year.

6.3 Continuing Education Reorganization (Attachments G, H, and J)
Superintendent/President Gaskin emphasized how important it was to reiterate the context that these recommendations are being made; they are going out to all external and internal stakeholders as well as to the Academic Senate and the Board. Throughout the months of August and September, Dr. Gaskin added she and EVP Jack Friedlander made presentations on the re-visioning/re-engineering of the Continuing Education Division nearly a dozen times.
Continuing Education has a long and rich tradition and history throughout the Santa Barbara community and it is a very critical element in SBCC’s history and notion of our academic programs and instructional programs.

Dr. Gaskin explained there were four or five elements that have caused us to be where we are today. There are several things that have been at play for 3 to 4 years and even longer. There have always been priorities in the System and they have been codified in the Education Code; they are nothing new to us. Ed code very clearly states, our primary mission is Transfer and Voc (an old term). There is a hierarchy of admission and the second level/second tier are called Essential and Important (ESL, Basic Skills, Non-Credit) but do not have the same stature as primary mission. The third tier are those that are called Authorized but at a tertiary level (Community Service or fee based courses). We have always had these priorities. About five years ago, when the funding formula legislation SB 361 passed, the state put out a carrot and a stick. Heretofore, all of CE was non-credit. The state controls everything we do and they said these were the priorities, but we are going to differentiate them for you and make it more attractive to do some types of non-credit and less attractive to do other types. The state does this not only with regulations, but they do it with money. The state said they would give more money for what they called Enhanced non-credit (ESL, GED, Basic Skills, Short term vocational) and the state said they would hold the line on reimbursement for what they believed were less central to our purpose and our being (Older Adult, Public Safety, Parenting, etc.). This has been with us for a while, and then in 2009-2010 we had the first year of workload reduction. Not only were our budgets reduced in a draconian way the legislature had made it very clear, that we needed to keep our cuts very far away from Transfer, Career and Technical Education, and Basic Skills. In other words, what they were saying loud and clear, get out of this state subsidy when you are turning away students in the three areas of Enhanced non-credit. When the state cannot give the money the college would have to make those hard calls. This hit not only the non-credit, it hit in physical education, music, theatre, and art. Anything perceived as vocational lifelong enrichment; the non-enhanced, non-credit all took a hit.

Community Colleges do a great job with access but community colleges do not do such a great job in success/goal attainment. The focus now is on access to success and that strengthens the interest the state has in ensuring we have an educated citizenry. To ensure that first generation college students, new high school graduates, ESL learners, the educationally disenfranchised, the newly unemployed, the returning VETs, all have access to education. That access leads to goal attainment. There are many pathways to goal attainment and the legislature knows that non-credit is a path into higher education for the disenfranchised and the underprepared. With some of the Title 5 regulations, noncredit has been transitioning to look a tad more like credit.

The proposal and recommendation: 1) to take Continuing Education and to differentiate it into fee based courses (enrichment and life-long learning (the non-enhanced). The fee based modality (Center for Lifelong Learning) would be outside of the state subsidies and be fiscally self-sustaining and support a lean/moderated infrastructure to keep all costs low; 2) to integrate the non-credit into Educational Programs. Non-credit is an Academic/Instructional Program and regulated by all the curriculum standards of Title 5 and Educational Programs needs to own that. Effective/Operational July 1: the CE staff, 8 administrators and 8 classified positions will be discontinued. The goal: that through attrition and new positions that might open up, we can purposely absorb these classified and be at net zero by June 30. There will be external career and
job transition consultants to provide free unlimited support services to those who might be impacted.

President-elect Neufeld recommended reviewing the org charts, see agenda Attachment D, which is the Fee Based solution and Attachment E and F the Non-credit Educational Programs solution. President-elect Neufeld believed there were two areas the Senate could weigh in on: 1) Establish some type of communication between the Center for Lifelong Learning and the credit side, and, 2) The impact on the dozen or so departments, the non-credit course integration would have, e.g. department chairs, and staff.

Dr. Friedlander added the funding model for the CLL still to be determined. President Nevins reported this would be presented at the next CPC and he sought direction from the Senate to give to the faculty representatives at CPC on the overall plan and direction. And, if they were in support, how would they like to be involved in the integration process, because this would affect and impact a number of departments, where there will be common issues. President Nevins would like to then form an ad hoc workgroup to work with departments, and interested/affected others through the implementation details. Dr. Friedlander explained he would ask the Board to approve the overall reorganization (at the Policy level). What he would not be asking the Board or CPC to approve, because we are not ready, are the details, the procedures on how this would be implemented.

The Senate agreed/concurred.

6.4 Proposition 30 Impacts
Senator Morris announced that if you have any suggestions/recommendations for the information in the handout to please notify himself or Kathy O’Connor.

6.5 Allocation of TLUs between departments.
To be brought forward to next agenda.

7.0 Adjourn

KEY: M/S/C – Moved/Seconded/Carried (motion is approved) M/S/D – Moved/Seconded/Defeated (motion fails)